



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	GORMAN	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	D	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
06/24/99	06/24/99				

HM11/0624

EDWIN P CHING
DNAX RESEARCH INSTITUTE
901 CALIFORNIA AVE
PALO ALTO CA 94304-1104

TUNG, MEXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

06/24/99

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/911,423

Applicant(s)

Gorman, et al.

Examiner

Mary Tung

Group Art Unit

1644



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mary Tung(3) Mr. Gerald P. Keleher(2) Dr. David Saunders(4) Mr. Edwin ChingDate of Interview Jun 23, 1999Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description:

An informal communication containing draft claims and response was sent via facsimile transmission for consideration by the examiners prior to the interview.

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: All pending claims

Identification of prior art discussed:

None

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiners agreed that the term "mature polypeptide" was adequately supported in the specification on page 19, lines 6 and 7 and on page 20, lines 25-36 as meaning a sequence in which the N-terminal leader sequence is cleaved. Also, the examiners agreed that the polynucleotide sequences recited in Claim 32 were not new matter because these sequences were disclosed as encoding the peptide without the leader sequence, as described on page 20, lines 25-36 and in the sequence listing. The examiners also agreed that degenerate variants were adequately disclosed on page 7, lines 16-34. The examiners also agreed that the rejections under 112/2 appear to be resolved in view of the proposed amendment. The applicants agreed to delete "allelic variant" and "species variant" from the limitations of claim 39. The applicants will submit a formal amendment incorporating the changes in a timely fashion.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Mary Tung 6/23/99
MARY TUNG
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1644